STEIN &

Case 3:06-cv-02361-WHA Document 45 Filed 09/18/2006 Page 1 of 8 1 ALSCHULER GROSSMAN STEIN & KAHAN LLP Marshall B. Grossman (No. 35958) William J. O'Brien (No. 99526) 2 Tony D. Chen (No. 176635) Dominique N. Thomas (No. 231464) 3 The Water Garden 4 1620 26th Street Fourth Floor, North Tower Santa Monica, CA 90404-4060 Telephone: 310-907-1000 5 6 Facsimile: 310-907-2000 Email: mgrossman@agsk.com 7 wobrien@agsk.com tchen@agsk.com dthomas@agsk.com 8 9 Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant, Blockbuster Inc. 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 13 NETFLIX, INC., a Delaware corporation, CASE NO. C 06 2361 WHA Plaintiff, **BLOCKBUSTER'S** 14 PRELIMINARY INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS FOR U.S. 15 VS. PATENT NO. 6,584,450 16 BLOCKBUSTER INC., a Delaware corporation, DOES 1-50, Complaint Filed: April 4, 2006 17 Defendants. 18 19 BLOCKBUSTER INC., a Delaware corporation, 20 Counterclaimant, 21 VS. 22 NETFLIX, INC., a Delaware corporation, 23 Counterclaim Defendant. 24 Pursuant to Patent Local Rule 3-3 and the Court's Case Management 25 Order filed June 30, 2006, Defendant and Counterclaimant, Blockbuster Inc., 26 hereby states its Preliminary Invalidity Contentions as to United States Patent 27 No. 6,584,450, issued on June 24, 2003, entitled "Method and Apparatus for 28 ALSCHULER BLOCKBUSTER'S PRELIMINARY INVALIDITY GROSSMAN CONTENTIONS FOR U.S. PATENT NO. 6,584,450 C 06 2361 WHA KAHAN LLP

Renting Items" (hereinafter referred to as "the '450 Patent").

This statement of Preliminary Invalidity Contentions is based on the information currently available to Blockbuster and is subject to revision. Discovery from Netflix and third parties remains pending, and other investigations are still in progress. Among other things, Netflix has to date failed to produce multiple categories of documents requested by Blockbuster related to prior art, and Netflix delayed producing more than 20,000 pages of documents that were due August 14, 2006, until September 13, 2006, making it impossible for Blockbuster to thoroughly review those documents prior to submitting these Preliminary Invalidity Contentions.

This statement is provided without prejudice to all rights to supplement or modify Blockbuster's contentions as additional information is obtained, further research and analysis are completed, and patent claims are construed. This statement is also made without waiver or limitation of any attorney-client privilege, work product protection or any other privileges or evidentiary objections whatsoever.

I. INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS BASED ON 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

A. IDENTIFICATION OF PRIOR ART

1 Prior Art Patents and Published Patent Applications

Prior art patents and published patent applications identified for purposes of these Preliminary Invalidity Contentions are listed in Exhibit A attached hereto.

Prior Art Publications

Prior art publications (other than published patent applications) identified for purposes of these Preliminary Invalidity Contentions are listed in Exhibit B attached hereto.

27 ///

28 ///

Claims 66 through 80 6

A Claim Chart for Claims 66 through 80 of the '450 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit L.

27 ///

1

2

3

7

11

17

21

22

24

25

26

28 ///

7 Claims 81 through 95

A Claim Chart for Claims 81 through 95 of the '450 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit M.

8 Claims 96 through 100

A Claim Chart for Claims 96 through 100 of the '450 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit N.

II. <u>INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS BASED ON 35 U.S.C. § 112</u>

Claims 1-100 of the '450 Patent are invalid for failure to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

A. 35 U.S.C. § 112, PARAGRAPH 2

The '450 Patent and all claims thereof are invalid for indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. $\S 112\P 2$.

Blockbuster's grounds for this contention include, without limitation, that the following claim terms are indefinite:

- (1) "computer-implemented method;"
- (2) "renting;"
- (3) "attributes;"
- (4) "ordered list;"
- (5) "based upon the order of the list;"
- (6) "item selection criteria;"
- (7) "providing to the customer up to a specified number of the one or more items;"
- (8) "wherein a total current number of items provided to the customer does not exceed the specified number;"
- (9) "wherein a total number of items provided to the customer within a specified period of time does not exceed a specified time;
- (10) "the one or more item selection criteria indicates a desired order;"

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

apparatus and a method of using that apparatus renders a claim indefinite under section 112, paragraph 2. *Ex parte Lyell*, 17 USPQ 2d 1548 (1990). . . . This rule is well recognized and has been incorporated into the PTO's *Manual of Patent Examination Procedure*.

§ 2173.05(p)(II) (1999) ('A single claim which claims both an apparatus and the method steps of using the apparatus is indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.'); *see also* Robert C. Faber, *Landis on Mechanics of Patent Claim Drafting* § 60A (2001) ('Never mix claim types to different classes of invention in a single claim.'). "

IPXL, 430 F.d at 1384.

B. 35 U.S.C. § 112, PARAGRAPH 1

The Court's Patent Local Rules do not require any disclosure in Preliminary Invalidity Contentions concerning best-mode defenses. *Fresenius Med. Care Holdings, Inc. v. Baxter Int'l, Inc.*, No. C 03-1431 SBA, 2006 WL 1329997 (N.D. Cal. May 15, 2006); *see* Pat. L.R. 3-3(d). Blockbuster provides the following information as a courtesy, without prejudice to its presentation of any additional or different defenses at any time.

Blockbuster contends that the '450 Patent and all claims thereof are invalid for failure to disclose best mode as required by 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1. Blockbuster's grounds for this contention include, without limitation, the following:

1. Claims of the '450 Patent recite selecting items (or, more specifically, movies) for delivery to a customer. The '450 Patent does not disclose any mode of selecting items or movies that prioritizes between requests of different customers. For example, and without limitation:

///

1	a. The '450 Patent does not disclose any mode of selecting
2	items or movies for customers that takes into account how often a customer
3	returns movies or other items and receives new ones;
4	b. The '450 Patent does not disclose any step, method,
5	device, or feature for anything known or described as "throttling."
6	2. Claims of the '450 Patent recite delivery of movies or other
7	items to customers and delivery by mail.
8	a. The '450 Patent does not disclose any mode of delivery of
9	movie or other items to customers by mail that includes any particular type,
10	design, or features for the envelope or package used for such delivery.
11	Indeed, the '450 Patent do not refer to an envelope or packaging at all.
12	b. The '450 Patent does not disclose any particular type,
13	design, or feature for return of monies or other items by a customer.
14	III. <u>INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS BASED ON 35 U.S.C. § 101</u>
15	The Court's Patent Local Rules do not require any disclosure in
16	Preliminary Invalidity Contentions concerning § 101 defenses. See Pat. L.R. 3-
17	3(d). Blockbuster presents the following information as a courtesy, without
18	prejudice to its presentation of any additional or different defense at any time in the
19	future.
20	Claims 1-100 of the '450 Patent are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101.
21	Blockbuster contends that the '450 Patent and each and every
22	individual claim thereof are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the subject
23	matter of each such claim is not patentable under that section or under Article I,
24	Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
25	Blockbuster's grounds for these contentions include, without
26	limitation:
27	
28	

	Case 3:06-cv-02361-WHA Document 45 Filed 09/18/2006 Page 8 of 8
4	
1	1. Each such claim fails to set forth a patentable invention or
2	"discovery" by an "inventor" within the meaning of Article I, Section 8;
3	2. Each such claim fails to set forth a patentable invention under
4	38 U.S.C. § 101;
5	3. Each such patent and claim improperly attempts to provide
6	patent protection for a business method;
7	4. Each such patent and claim improperly attempts to provide
8	patent protection for an algorithm; and
9	5. Each such patent and claim otherwise fails to meet
10	Constitutional, statutory, or case law requirements for patentability.
11	Based on the reasons stated above, Blockbuster contends that the '450
12	Patent and each and every individual claim thereof are invalid.
13	
14	DATED: Sept. 18, 2006 ALSCHULER GROSSMAN STEIN & KAHAN LLP
15	
16 17	By /s/ William J. O'Brien
17 18	Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant, Blockbuster Inc.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
~	BLOCKBUSTER'S PRELIMINARY INVALIDITY